

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 46, 52, 57, 67 and 91-101 are pending. Claims 91-101 are new. Claims 46, 91, 95, 99 and 100 are independent. Claim 46, 52, 57, 62, 67 and 72 have been amended. Claims 1-45, 47-51, 53-56, 58-61, 63-66 and 68-71 and 73-90 have been canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has indicated that claim 46 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 46 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 44.

Additionally, since claims 52, 57, 62, 67 and 72 depend directly or indirectly on allowed claim 46, it is submitted that these claims are also now allowable.

Claim for Priority

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has recognized the Applicants' claim for foreign priority. In view of the fact that the Applicants' claim for foreign priority has been perfected, no additional action is required from the Applicants at this time.

Drawings

Attached hereto are replacement sheets containing Figures 3

and 6 of the drawings. In Figs. 3 and 6, in elements 32 and 82, respectively, the word "portion" has been amended to --Portion--, i.e., the letter "P" has been capitalized, so that these figures are consistent with the remainder of the drawings.

Acknowledgment of Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has acknowledged the Information Disclosure Statements filed on March 17, 2000, June 28, 2000 (a corrected Form PTO-1449 only was submitted) and December 19, 2002. Initialed copies of the PTO-1449 Forms have been received from the Examiner. No further action is necessary at this time.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 43, 49, 50, 51, 54-56, 58-61, 64-66, 68, 70-71, 83, 85, 86 and 88-90 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). Since all of the stated claims have been canceled, this objection to the claims has been obviated.

Claims 52, 57, 62, 67 and 72 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form because they depended directly or indirectly on claim 46. Since claim 46 has been amended to place the same in independent form, all of the objection to claims 52, 57, 62, 67 and 72 is moot and these claims are now in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 37 C.F.R. § 112

Claims 63 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Since claims 63 and 73 have been canceled, this rejection has been obviated.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 38-42, 44-48, 53, 74-82, 84 and 87 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,926).

As indicated above, claims 38-42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 53, 74-82, 84 and 87 have been canceled.

According to MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of anticipation

because the cited reference, Chui et al., fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Chui et al. discloses a technique of decomposing image data on the screen into tiles and encoding each tile by a wavelet-like transform for the purpose of reducing the processing memory in a digital camera. On the contrary, one feature of the present invention is that the management information for managing the coded information of each tile encoded separately by wavelet transform includes "information for specifying a memory location of the coded information corresponding to each tile or each resolution" and "information for managing and identifying each tile or each resolution". This feature brings about the effect that it becomes possible to extract the coded information corresponding to the tile or the resolution necessary for a decoding device and to "decode a desired area of image in a desired resolution".

This is not either disclosed or suggested by Chui et al.

New Claims

New claims 91-101 have been added. Claims 91, 95, 99 and 100 are independent claims and set forth preferred embodiments of the present invention. Claims 92-94 depend on main claim 91, claims 96-98 depend on main claim 95 and claim 101 depends on main claim 100.

It is believed that the new claims clearly distinguish over

Chui et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be indicated as allowable.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Daniel K. Dorsey (Reg. No. 32,520) at the telephone number of (703) 205-8000 to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,


BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Terrell C. Birch, #19,382

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

TCB/DKD/slb
1907-0190P

Attachments:  Abstract of the Disclosure
Replacement Sheets containing Figs. 3 and 6